*Persons who were running the Mines during 1952-53.*

| | No. of accidents |
|---|---|
| (1) Sri Rama Narayan Singh, Proprietor, Manganese Mines, Hazargavidugga Chicknaikanahalli ... | 2 |
| (2) Sri K. Rajiah Setty, Proprietor, Manganese Mines, Netramani Gudda, Chickanaikanahalli ... | 1 |
| Total ... | 3 |

*Dates of accidents* :—

(1) 27th May 1953,
(2) 14th February 1953.

(*c*) Rs. 1,000 each.

In two cases, the compensation amounts are under payment.

In one case the amount has been ordered to be deposited. The amount is due to be paid to the widow and mother of deceased workman Seegiah, who was working in Netramani Gudda in Chicknaikanahalli Taluk.

(*d*) and (*e*) Mining Labour being now a Central subject, the State Government has no information to furnish on these two questions.

---

**Scholarships (High Schools and Middle Schools).**

*Q.*—660. Sri H. K. SIDDIAH (Belur—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of applications for scholarships received from the students of High Schools and Middle Schools in the State during 1953-54 ;

(*b*) of them, the number of boy students and girl students that have received scholarship and the number of students who have not received scholarship ?

*A.*—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) High School ... 20,209
Middle School ... 22,234

(*b*) (*i*) Number of Boys and Girls awarded scholarships :—

| | Boys | Girls |
|---|---|---|
| High Schools ... | 3,049 | 216 |
| Middle do ... | 2,986 | 562 |

(*ii*) Number of students not awarded scholarships :—

High Schools ... 16,944
Middle Schools ... 18686

---

**Dam across Hemavathi near Gorur.**

*Q.*—686. Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Channarayapatna).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether any survey has been made regarding the construction of a dam across the Hemavathi river near Gorur ; if so, when that survey was made ;

(*b*) what the estimated cost was ;

(*c*) what may be the revised cost ;

(*d*) how many acres of land were estimated to be brought under irrigation ;

(*e*) how many acres of cultivated lands are expected to be submerged ;

(*f*) the taluks which are expected to be benefited by this project ?

*A.*—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes, during 1933-35.
(*b*) Rs. 1.9 crores.
(*c*) About Rs. 6 crores.
(*d*) About 45,000 acres.
(*e*) About 9,451 acres.
(*f*) Hassan, Holenarsipur, Arkalgud, Channarayapatna and Krishnarajpet.

---

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**
**(Money Bills.)**

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now Legislative Business.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPAN AIK (Molakalmuru).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Under Rule 50 of the Rules of Procedure Government should have furnished a memorandum of expenditure along with

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

the money Bills, which has not been done. No memorandum of the probable expenditure has been furnished, Sir. It is a mandatory provision of law under Rule 50. So, Sir, unless the Government furnish the financial memorandum giving the financial implication, these money bills cannot be taken up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Has the Leader anything to say ?

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—I have not applied my mind to it. It has come up suddenly.

SRI M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I would request the Chair to give an opportunity to this House to discuss this point of order. Rule 50 of the Rules of Procedure is quite specific. As Sri Bheemappa Naik put it, it is mandatory and I read it with your permission :

> "50. (1) A Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses relating thereto and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law."

Here so many bills are placed before us. The first Bill is the Mysore Sales-tax (Amendment) Bill. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons there is no financial memorandum appended to it. Even with regard to the other Bill, the Mysore Stamp (Amendment) Bill, 1954 there is only a Statement of Objects and Reasons and no financial memorandum is appended. Even the statement is very meagre and very unsatisfactory. With regard to the other Financial Bills, the Mysore Court Fee (Amendment) Bill and others, there is no such memorandum, but there is only a Statement of Objects and Reasons extending only to 3½ lines. In the case of the Madras Sales-tax (Amendment) Bill and several other money bills, the provisions of the rules of procedure of the Mysore Legislative Assembly are not complied with and this prevents us from taking up the consideration of these Bills. Of course, we are also equally anxious that these bills should be discussed and final decision taken today itself if possible. But we are bound by these Rules of Procedure and as such we are prevented from taking up these Bills unless the financial memorandum is also appended to these several Bills as required by the Rule that I have just quoted.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—Sir, I have just looked into the Rules and I will be able to offer my opinion. Rule 50, cl. (1) reads as follows :

> "A bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses relating thereto..."

And Section 207 of the Constitution also makes different provisions for Revenue Bills as well as Expenditure Bills. Article 207 (3) is as follows :

> "A bill which, if enacted and brought into operation, would involve expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of a State shall not be passed by a House of the Legislature of the State unless the Governor has recommended to that House the consideration of the Bill."

If a Bill envisages any expenditure out of the Consolidated Fund, then how that expenditure will be met requires to be placed before the House through a memorandum. The Bills that have been introduced, all of them, are Bills not of expenditure but of revenue. Therefore that clause is not applicable to these Bills. The objection raised therefore has no applicability to the present Financial Bills.

*SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, the Hon'ble Chief Minister said that these Bills do not involve expenditure. First the receipts go to the Consolidated Fund and then expenditure is incurred. Let us take for example the Bill on the increase of land revenue ; on the increase, we will have to pay a potgi to the patels and shanbhogues which also is additional expenditure. Take for example the Stamps and Registration Bill. That will entail expenditure

*Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

and commission will have to be paid. Whatever it is, the Government must point out: here is so much realisation from this source, and the expenditure is going to be so much and net income would be this. The object is: supposing a Bill is passed and it involves expenditure much more than the receipts expected under the Bill, it would be an unwise step. Therefore, in order to bring to the notice of the House what the probable expenditure would be and what its implications on the Consolidated Fund would, be this provision is made, Sir. Similarly, take for example the Sales-tax Bill. It may be that under the new Act, the payments that are now being made may have to be increased. We do not know what it is. It may be said that merely because we levy further tax, we need not incur extra expenditure on establishment. Even by minimising expenditure our revenue may be augmented. We might even say that in view of that, there is no need to make any changes. All these particulars have to be given while introducing the Bill; at least after introducing but before taking these Bills into consideration, a memorandum of the probable expenditure of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure has to be given. In a Bill contemplating to levy a tax like the Betterment Tax it may be that there may be non-recurring expenditure involving huge sums because you may spread over the receipts to the tune of only one year's receipts. You might levy this Betterment Tax for a period of 20 years or 10 years. But when once you take up a certain item involving non-recurring expenditure to the tune of crores, you are committed to

1-30 P.M.

how many works you are going to take and all that. There is no Bill, in fact, in which, one way or the other, expenditure is not to be incurred. The Section which the Chief Minister quoted does not apply here. Because there is no such thing as expenditure alone being brought in a Bill. These are all Money Bills where there will be both receipts and expenditure. What is the net revenue that we get deducting the expenditure, is the final thing. It is with that object that expenditure should be mentioned whenever a Bill is brought in the form of a memorandum. Therefore, I do not agree with the contention of the Chief Minister that there is no expenditure incurred.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—We have passed hundreds of Bills; on no occasion such an objection was raised.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It is a provision of law which I have brought to the notice of the Government. In the beginning you did not know: now you read the section. When I first objected you said, 'I do not know, Sir' and now somebody has enlightened you and you make this statement as though you knew it from ages. It is not correct, Mr. Chief Minister. (*Laughter*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri Bheemappa Naik, I cannot allow you to go on like this. You cannot address the Chief Minister; you must address the Chair.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, the Chief Minister said in the beginning that he did not know. If he had passed hundreds of such Bills, where was the necessity for him to say that he did not know and that he would study? If the House satisfies or the Leader of the House satisfies me that there is nothing substantial in my objection, I am prepared to withdraw my point of order; that is a different point altogether. But I am entitled to point out, and I put it before you that rule 50 of the standing order needs a statement of expenditure to be given along with the Bills.

*Sri M. MADIAH (Nanjangud—Scheduled Castes).—Whatever it may be, Sir, I submit to the Chair that under rule 169 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business the relevant rule, *viz.*, 50, may be suspended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You cannot apply that now: I have not yet given my ruling.

Sri M. MADIAH.—If the point of order is held that it is in order, this may be done; otherwise this question of suspending rule 50 does not arise at all. A doubt has arisen whether this Money Bill comes under rule 50.

(SRI M. MADIAH.)

So, the remedy seems to me, to suspend the rule under rule 169. The only days allotted for legislative business is for to-day and to-morrow and it may not be possible for Government to take up these legislative measures before the end of the official year. To cure the trouble, I submit to the Chair to suspend rule 50 for the present and take up the legislative business set apart for the day.

SRI T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—Sir, my friend Sri Madiah is under the impression that Bills must be taken only today and to-morrow and they cannot be taken sometime later. There is no such thing as Money Bills being lapsed. There is scope for this Bill to be considered at any time. Demands for Grants are to be passed by 31st March so that expenditure may be incurred from 1st April. Nothing prevents these Bills being taken even after April 1st. The only point is, whether the point of order is proper and not the question of suspending the rule. The question is one of establishing a healthy convention.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not think it is necessary to have all these Bills passed before the end of the month. Whether there is any objection in taking up the Bills is the point for consideration,

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—Sir, I think, there is no point of order because rule 50 envisages expenditure. Taking for instance the Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) (Amendment) Bill, even under the proposed expenditure, according to the Budget, it is not going to be enhanced. The Bill says instead of two pies, four pies may be substituted. But rule 50 envisages only expenditure. If this Bill is introduced, there is no extra expenditure involved to Government. I suggest therefore, Sir, that such of those Bills where no expenditure is involved, may be taken up to-day. Sales-tax, for instance, according to my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik, involves expenditure.

SRI R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Sri Devaraj Urs said there is no point of order. I refer to the Mysore Land Revenue and Water Rate (Increase of Levy) Bill. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is said, "Irrigational and other facilities have been provided at great expense by the State for the improvement of agriculture." So, this is going to involve expenditure and so it comes under rule 50.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The point of order raised by Sri A. Bheemappa Naik is that a financial memorandum should be attached to this Bill. I have examined the position but feel that you have to draw a distinction between the two kinds of Bills—a Bill definitely involving only receipt and a Bill definitely involving only expenditure. That Bill comes under rule 50 which involves only the expenditure item; for example, the Religious Inams Bill involves expenditure to Government. That is very clear and in that Bill you will see a Financial Memorandum has been attached. But in this Bill, it is only a question of income to the Government. In the Bill, as it is framed, there is no clause denoting any item of expenditure. The income derived from this Act will go to the Consolidated Fund. For that matter, any money that comes to the Government will be expended in some direction or other. Unless the item mentions any item of expenditure, I hold that this does not come under rule 50. So, there is no point of order and the Government may proceed with the Bill.

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I want clarification on another point. We are expected to consider very important Bills involving these taxations and only two days have been allotted. It was just now pointed out by you that nothing prevents us from deferring these Bills to next month. Under rule 131(2) we are expected to finish the discussion of all these Bills before to-morrow, finish before guillotine is applied, because all these come under the Finance Bill and Finance Bills must be considered and finished within the allotted time. That is why I submitted last time alone to the Speaker that the time allotted is very inadequate and we cannot do full

justice and the Hon'ble Members of this House cannot bestow as much time as they actually require. Now, I want to know which is the Bill that is going to be taken or selected, whether we are expected to consider all these Bills *en bloc* or each Bill. I assure the House that the consideration of one Bill will take two days. The Land Revenue Bill is of such an important nature that two days are quite insufficient. I want to know the procedure. If the House takes two days for the consideration of one Bill, what do you do with the other Bills ? I want a ruling on this. For the consideration of the Bills there is no imposition of any restriction on the members. If we discuss only one Bill and if all the other Bills are left, is it expected that the Chair will apply guillotine ? That kind of applying guillotine, I am sure, will bring dissatisfaction to the entire House.

**Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T. Narasipur).—I may be permitted to place before this House some observations regarding the point just now raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

In the financial Bills that are placed before us,, definite dates are prescribed as the time from which they come into force. It is stated in the Mysore Land Revenue and Water Rate (Increase of Levy) Bill that it shall come into force from 1st July 1954. In the Stamp (Amendment) Bill it is stated that it shall come into force from 1st April 1954. Similarly in the Mysore Court Fees (Amendment) Bill, it is stated that it shall come into force form 1st April 1954. So in almost all financial Bills, except the Land Revenue and Water Rate (Increase of Levy) Bill, time limit has been prescribed. From what the Chief Minister was saying it must be taken as coming into effect from 1st April 1954.

Just now it was pointed out that under rule 131 the Speaker has power to apply guillotine to-morrow. If all these Bills have to be considered in two days only, then very little time will be left over for us to do justice. I believe greater injustice will be done to the tax-payer. Because, we will not have the necessary time to discuss them, not even to go through them.

Further, many of the original Acts to which these amending Bills refer are not available in the library. There may be one or two copies available. But the subsequent amendments to the original Acts have not been posted up-to-date and it has become very hard for us to look to the original Act and study with reference to the amendments.

Therefore, since these proposals involve the collection of taxes to the tune of a crore of rupees and odd; we should have greater time so that we may study and do justice to the tax payer.

**Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY** (Chitaldrug).—When some of the members were speaking on the Budget and offering suggestions regarding these taxation proposals, you were pleased to remark that they can take their own time and speak as much as they please and to any length when the taxation proposals are placed before them. In view of that, if all these eight taxation measures are to be taken up and finished within two days, we will not be doing any justice to ourselves. And we will be doing great injustice to the tax-payer. These taxation proposals are going to involve nearly 90 lakhs of people with heavy taxes. It will be unjust on our part to pass these Bills in such a hurry. I would therefore earnestly request the Government to see that these Bills are taken up after the end of this month, *i.e.*, the first week of next month.

**Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA** (Leader of the House).—All these difficulties have been taken into consideration and the time has been fixed by the Hon'ble Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition in every session of the Assembly goes on making several requests, both at the beginning and in the middle, for extension of time. There must also be a well-established procedure regarding the time to be fixed for each item of business. The Hon'ble Speaker has exercised his discretion and has fixed the dates. Postponement of the passing of these Bills dislocates the work of not only this House but also of the other

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

House. Therefore whatever has been fixed by the Speaker may be adhered to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Opposition has got a right to express its opinion.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I have been submitting from the beginning, not only this year but even from the previous year, that injustice is done.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Not injustice.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Chief Minister brought in the name of the Speaker. He is not at all responsible for the time fixed. He is guided by the material supplied by the Government. If the Government had prepared the Budget in time, perhaps the Speaker would have done justice and given more time for discussion of these Bills.

Secondly, it must be noted that this is the first time we are having such a large number of finance Bills, not one or two. In the previous years there used to be only one or two minor Bills involving minor taxation. But this year we are having too many Bills involving heavy taxation and two days' time to discuss all of them will not be enough. It looks as though the Government do not want to give adequate time to consider this Bill. They want us to rush through these Bills irrespective of the consequences on the people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Chief Minister has just now stated the difficulties in postponing the discussion on the Bills. At the same time I do not propose to curtail the privileges of the members of this House. Under the rules members have ample scope to discuss these Bills. But since the Leader of the House has explained the difficulties to postpone, we shall take up the Bills one by one. The Leader can select which Bill may be taken up first and we shall see about the time limit, if we cannot complete it before tomorrow. I see that there are many objections to take them up even at the end of this month.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I want a ruling from the Chair on the point raised. I want an assurance both from the Leaders of the House and from the Chair that the remaining Bills may be postponed to a future date. I expressed my views in the beginning. But I am afraid that Government may insist tomorrow on the Bills being passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not think it is left to the Leader. On the question of postponement I think we will have to take his opinion. That is all.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But rule 131 (2) enables the Chair to apply guillotine.

Sri M. MADIAH.—I want clarification from the Chair as to whether rule 131 applies also to Money Bills other than the Appropriation Bills, because it reads like this:

> "'Finance Bill' means 'the Bill ordinarily introduced in each year to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government for the next following financial year and includes a Bill to give effect to supplementary financial proposals for any period..."

I understand that this rule will apply only to Appropriation Bills. But the Leader of the Opposition raised the point and was trying to know from the Chair whether the Bills supposed to be introduced today and tomorrow also come under that rule. I want clarification from the Chair on that point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes, it applies to these Bills which are before us.

Sri M. MADIAH.—But the Bills contemplated under rule 131 relate to Appropriation Bills.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not think it applies to Appropriation Bills. It relates to Finance Bills, *i.e.*, taxation Bills.

Sri M. MADIAH.—The rule says—

> "... to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government for the next following financial year....."

I want to know whether it also applies to the other Bills contemplated to be introduced.....

A MEMBER.—Which are the other Bills contemplated to be introduced tomorrow ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—But these Bills have already been presented to the House. They are Financial Bills.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—May I make one small observation with regard to rule 131 ? We have to draw a distinction between the Finance Bill in which certain taxes are proposed but are not included in the Budget and other Bills. Without passing the Finance Bills, we will not be completing the Budget. What is before us is mere taxation proposal. The proceeds of the taxation proposals have not been included in the Budget. And as the Hon'ble Finance Minister has already remarked, it is with a view to bridge the deficit gap that these taxation proposals are placed before the House. Under such a contingency, we have to consider whether the word 'Finance Bill' should be taken to mean fresh taxation proposals. If the proceeds of the taxation proposals have already been taken into consideration and added on in the Budget and we are asked to vote the Demands and then the Appropriation Bill, it is but right that we should immediately pass those Finance Bills. But in this case it is not so. These taxation proposals have to be considered on merits. To the extent to which we accept them or modify them, to that extent credit will be taken in the Budget. Therefore in the absence of the proceeds of the taxation measures being included in the Budget, I believe the limited construction put under rule 131 is not applicable. It is only in respect of a Finance Bill, as in the Central Parliament, where the taxation measures have already been included and even prior intimation given to all the changes proposed to see that moneys are also collected, with a view to give effect to such a measure, rule 131 is made applicable. But it is not so here. I believe that in respect of an ordinary course of discussion on these bills in this House, we need not put a limited construction. In this very House precedents are not wanting to show that taxation measures have been discussed on 1st April. Take for instance petrol taxation measure to increase motor taxation. There are precedents when we have discussed such Bills after the Appropriation Bill has been approved. Therefore it does not come in the way of passing the Budget ; it does not come in the way of accepting the Appropriation Bill which the Government are likely to place before this House on the last day. Therefore, from this point of view there is no limitation and we need not put a limitation upon ourselves. As one Hon'ble Member pointed out with regard to Land Revenue and Water Rate (Increase of Levy) Bill, it comes into force from 1st July 1954; there is enough time for us to discuss these measures. We need not hurry through merely because only two days are allotted. I believe the Treasury Bench will give sufficient assurance to the Opposite Bench. It is better that they are discussed in all aspects and the significance of the measures understood well.

Sri M. MADIAH.—There is one other point which requires consideration. In the Budget, proposals are made on the receipts side keeping in view the income which may be derived out of the Bills contemplated.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No, no. The present deficit shown in the Budget does not take into account the anticipated income. I appreciate the arguments advanced by the members but my difficulty is we have to take up the Bills as they are presented now. This question of postponement will arise only at the end of tomorrow. When that time comes we shall see about it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am sorry to interrupt. Now alone an assurance may be given to us. Otherwise, the Treasury Bench may insist on the operation of rule 131 and say that under that rule all the measures must be guillotined. Let us come to an understanding now alone, and let us suspend the operation of this rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—we shall now take up the Bill. In regard to the point about postponement, I will give my ruling after 3-30.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Not only postponement. If the Chair says that it does not apply, then it is all right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already given my ruling that the Bills may be taken up now by Government.

Which Bill the Government propose to take up now?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—The Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) (Amendment) Bill.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—The next Bill will be Sales-Tax (Amendment) Bill today. And if time permits, the amending Bill touching Bellary, the Irrigation Amendment Bill and also Sales-Tax Amendment Bill may be taken up.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If you allow them to reach the third Bill, they are too willing.

---

## THE MYSORE ELECTRICITY (TAXATION ON CONSUMPTION) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

2 P.M.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) (Amendment) Bill, 1954, be taken into consideration."

Before I say anything about the Bill, I just wish to mention here that the Bill was introduced on the 8th instant. In the Bill as printed, there is a small error. Instead of "unit", the word 'rupees' has come up. In the original Act itself, there is no such thing as 'per rupee'. The original Act mentions only 2 pies per unit and in section 3, it says: "A tax calculated at a rate not exceeding 2 pies per unit". It is this that is proposed to be amended by this Bill, and so the word "rupee" is obviously an error; an erratum had been published and a fresh copy of the Bill is also published in which it is four pies per unit. So much for the error that had crept in.

Sir, in introducing this very small Bill, I wish to say one word especially as one that is new to the State and can appreciate the glories that are in this State much better than those that have been here for a long time. All over the land it is known that you have gold in Kolar. The world also knows that you have white gold started in Sivasamudram and carried on in Shimsha and now produced in Jog also. I say that this white gold is much more valuable than ordinary gold.

A MEMBER.—Platinum.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Platinum which is more valuable than the gold that is in Kolar though the latter is sought after by everybody.

I say that the white gold—electricity—is one of the most important productive agencies that the last century has been able to give to humanity and the people of Mysore have been very forward in appreciating the value and importance of developing this commodity. I am sure many have seen the small chart that has been published and about which all ought to be proud—I do not know whether this has been seen by every one. (Showing the chart) You will see, Sir, here in this chart one aspect of the use of electricity has been carried on in such a rapid manner. It started in 1928 and in the last four years especially the curve has gone up very much. This is the curve showing the increase in the use of electricity for lifting water. As we all know during the last four years, South India has suffered a great deal for want of adequate rains. Here in Mysore, people have been able to meet that handicap by using to as great an extent as possible electric power that is available here. In other fields also electricity has been used to a great extent. Indeed I am told, Sir, that even in the domestic sphere, electricity is being used for cooking purposes which is something not yet thought of in many parts of India. It has been calculated in Mysore they are using per capita 50 units of electric current whereas in rest of India it is only 12 units. This is indeed a remarkable thing. And equally important is its use in the industrial development.